From: Clarizio, Michele (MPCA)
Sent: Friday, March 09, 2018 1:13 PM
To: Udd, Jeff (MPCA) <jeff.udd@state.mn.us>; Smith, Jeff J (MPCA) <jeff.j.smith@state.mn.us>
Subject: FW: PolyMet Water Pollution and Degradation

## For the record....

From: Croitiene ganMoryn [mailto:adanto@jps.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2018 5:08 PM
Cc: Stine, John (MPCA) <john.stine@state.mn.us>
Subject: PolyMet Water Pollution and Degradation

## Dear Mr. Stine,

Arguably, the Minnesota DNR had an excuse for its weak PolyMet draft Permit to Mine. There are state laws saying that part of the DNR's mission is to encourage minerals development. The mission of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) is to protect the environment and Minnesota citizens from pollution.

- The MPCA draft water pollution permit for the PolyMet sulfide mine doesn't set limits on polluted seepage through groundwater to drinking water or surface water.
- The MPCA draft water pollution permit for the PolyMet doesn't even provide appropriate monitoring; PolyMet discharge in violation of the Clean Water Act could go completely undetected.
- The MPCA draft section 401 certification ignores the deficiencies in the water pollution permit and erroneously claims that the PolyMet sulfide mine project would not violate water quality standards or degrade Minnesota water quality.
- State agencies refused to evaluate impacts on human health from the PolyMet mine project using an open and public health impact assessment (HIA) process, even though 30,000 Minnesota medical and health professionals asked for an HIA to assess pollution threats including brain damage to fetuses, infants and children from mercury

contamination of fish.

 Now, the MPCA draft section 401 certification accepts PolyMet's "exclusions" and junk science to erroneously claim that the PolyMet sulfide mine project would not endanger the environment and human health.

I oppose this permit! Please DENY the PolyMet permit!

Sincerest Regards,

Croitiene n. ganMoryn