



MINING TRUTH
Know the truth. Make your choice.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

**MEDIA
ADVISORY**

January 5, 2018

Mining Truth Statement on Release of PolyMet Draft Permit to Mine

ST. PAUL – Today, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources published a draft permit to mine based on PolyMet Mining’s application and published a draft set of permit conditions. This initiates a public objection period on the draft permit that ends on March 6, 2018. The permit to mine is a central permit required for PolyMet to operate a copper-nickel sulfide mine in Minnesota, and would be the first such permit issued in Minnesota history.

Mining Truth released polling today conducted in December 2017 by Public Policy Polling showing a plurality of Minnesota voters oppose PolyMet’s proposed copper-nickel mine (the polling questions and crosstabs are attached). Kathryn Hoffman, Chief Executive Officer of the Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy released the following statement:

PolyMet’s sulfide mine proposal is unpopular with Minnesotans already – recent polling shows more Minnesotans oppose than support PolyMet’s proposal. This critical permit decision will have impacts for centuries. PolyMet has made lofty promises to treat polluted water for hundreds of years, prevent taxpayers from being stuck with a \$1 billion cleanup bill, and to meet or exceed industry best practices. Will PolyMet meet their promises to Minnesotans or will they break them? Our team of scientists, engineers, lawyers, and water quality experts will find out and share that information with Minnesotans.

Mining Truth is a coalition of Conservation Minnesota, Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness, and the Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy. Mining Truth was formed in 2012 to provide a resource for Minnesotans to get the facts about sulfide mining and its long-lasting impacts.

MORE INFO: For more information on the campaign, or to set up an interview with any of the leaders of Mining Truth, please contact:

Nate Dybvig at 651.230.3018 or nate@conservationminnesota.org,
David Gonnerman at 507.302.8769 or david@friends-bwca.org, or
Aaron Klemz at 651.287.4872 or aklemz@mncenter.org



MINING TRUTH

Know the truth. Make your choice.

POLYMET'S PROMISES TO MINNESOTA

Throughout review of PolyMet's proposal, the company, its boosters, and the State of Minnesota have made promises to Minnesotans. As we review draft permits, here are some of the promised outcomes we expect the permits to ensure. Will the promises to Minnesota be kept?

Protect taxpayers from being stuck with the costs of cleaning up pollution: "YES, taxpayers are financially protected and will not be on the hook for paying for anything that is the financial responsibility of mining companies." Frank Ongaro, Mining Minnesota, Letter to Gov. Mark Dayton, September 25, 2013.

Capture and treat 90% of the polluted groundwater: "At the Tailings Basin, PolyMet proposes a groundwater containment system that would capture at least 90% of seepage from the Tailings Basin and either return it to the Tailings Basin for reuse or treat it for discharge." PolyMet NorthMet SDEIS, November 2013, p. 5-6.

Use state of the art technology and meet or exceed industry best practices: "At every part of the environmental review and permitting process ... PolyMet has demonstrated that we can and will meet or exceed regulatory standards and industry best practices." PolyMet CEO Jon Cherry, December 13, 2017.

Meet and not seek to change the state's current wild rice sulfate standard using reverse osmosis water treatment technology: "The PolyMet project will meet Minnesota's sulfate standard for wild rice, using reverse osmosis (RO) technology. Established in 1973, the protective standard limits sulfate to 10 milligrams per liter in waters used for the production of wild rice." "PolyMet Mining Will Protect Minnesota's Wild Rice," gopolymet.com, November 27, 2014.

Protect the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness from contaminated groundwater flowing northward: "...PolyMet has already proposed to implement proactive measures to ensure that water does not flow north." PolyMet CEO Jon Cherry, Star Tribune, September 8, 2015

Update their decade-old financial projections (called a definitive feasibility study) before the permit is published: "...proceeds will be used to complete a Definitive Project and Cost Update, which PolyMet expects to complete around the same time as submission of formal permit applications, following the state's Record of Decision on the adequacy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement." PolyMet Press Release, January 27, 2016. "I've made it clear to the company that their financial capability to build this and then to operate it was going to be a critical component of my decision of whether the project will go forward or not." Gov. Mark Dayton, Associated Press, October 22, 2015.



Minnesota Survey Results

Q1 PolyMet Mining has proposed a copper-nickel mine near Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota upstream of Lake Superior. Based on what you know right now, would you say you support or oppose the PolyMet mine proposal?

Support 40%
Oppose 44%
Not sure 16%

Q2 Some people have said that a copper-nickel mine is acceptable upstream from Lake Superior but unacceptable upstream from the Boundary Waters. Which of the following statements comes closest to your view: copper-nickel mining is unacceptable and should not occur upstream from both Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters; copper-nickel mining is acceptable upstream from Lake Superior but unacceptable upstream from the Boundary Waters; or, copper-nickel mining is acceptable and should be permitted upstream from both Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters?

Copper-nickel mining is unacceptable and should not occur upstream from both Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters 48%
Copper-nickel mining is acceptable upstream from Lake Superior but unacceptable upstream from the Boundary Waters 17%
Copper-nickel mining is acceptable and should be permitted upstream from both Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters 26%
Not sure 8%

Q3 In the election for President, did you vote for Republican Donald Trump, Democrat Hillary Clinton, or someone else or did you not vote in the election?

Donald Trump 39%
Hillary Clinton 43%
Someone else / Did not vote 18%

Q4 If you are a woman, press 1. If a man, press 2.

Woman 53%
Man 47%

Q5 If you are a Democrat, press 1. If a Republican, press 2. If an independent, press 3.

Democrat 38%
Republican 29%
Independent 33%

Q6 If you are white, press 1. If African-American, press 2. If other, press 3.

White 90%
African American 10%
Other 0%

Q7 If you are 18-29 years old, press 1. If 30-45, press 2. If 46-65, press 3. If older than 65, press 4.

18 to 29 23%
30 to 45 47%
46 to 65 30%
Older than 65 0%





	Base	2016 Vote		
		Donald Trump	Hillary Clinton	Someone else / Did not vote
PolyMet Mine Proposal Support/Oppose				
Support	40%	65%	20%	36%
Oppose	44%	20%	64%	48%
Not sure	16%	15%	16%	16%

	Base	2016 Vote		
		Donald Trump	Hillary Clinton	Someone else / Did not vote
Copper-Nickel Mine Upstream Acceptable/- Unacceptable				
Copper-nickel mining - is unacceptable and should not occur upstream from both Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters	48%	23%	68%	56%
Copper-nickel mining - is acceptable upstream from Lake Superior but unacceptable upstream from the Boundary Waters	17%	23%	14%	9%
Copper -nickel mining- is acceptable and should be permitted upstream from both Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters	26%	43%	10%	29%
Not sure	8%	11%	8%	5%

	Base	Gender	
		Woman	Man
PolyMet Mine Proposal Support/Oppose			
Support	40%	31%	50%
Oppose	44%	51%	36%
Not sure	16%	17%	14%



	Base	Gender	
		Woman	Man
Copper-Nickel Mine Upstream Acceptable/-Unacceptable			
Copper-nickel mining - is unacceptable and should not occur upstream from both Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters	48%	56%	40%
Copper-nickel mining - is acceptable upstream from Lake Superior but unacceptable upstream from the Boundary Waters	17%	14%	19%
Copper -nickel mining - is acceptable and should be permitted upstream from both Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters	26%	20%	34%
Not sure	8%	9%	7%

	Base	Party		
		Democrat	Republican	Independent
PolyMet Mine Proposal Support/Oppose				
Support	40%	24%	64%	39%
Oppose	44%	62%	19%	45%
Not sure	16%	14%	17%	16%



	Base	Party		
		Democrat	Republican	Independent
Copper-Nickel Mine Upstream Acceptable/-Unacceptable				
Copper-nickel mining is unacceptable and should not occur upstream from both Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters	48%	68%	22%	49%
Copper-nickel mining is acceptable upstream from Lake Superior but unacceptable upstream from the Boundary Waters	17%	16%	23%	12%
Copper -nickel mining is acceptable and should be permitted upstream from both Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters	26%	11%	44%	29%
Not sure	8%	4%	12%	10%

	Base	Race	
		White	African American
PolyMet Mine Proposal Support/Oppose			
Support	40%	42%	21%
Oppose	44%	41%	71%
Not sure	16%	17%	7%





	Base	Race	
		White	African American
Copper-Nickel Mine Upstream Acceptable/-Unacceptable			
Copper-nickel mining - is unacceptable and should not occur upstream from both Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters	48%	45%	78%
Copper-nickel mining - is acceptable upstream from Lake Superior but unacceptable upstream from the Boundary Waters	17%	18%	1%
Copper -nickel mining- is acceptable and should be permitted upstream from both Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters	26%	27%	19%
Not sure	8%	9%	2%

	Base	Age		
		18 to 29	30 to 45	46 to 65
PolyMet Mine Proposal Support/Oppose				
Support	40%	47%	35%	43%
Oppose	44%	43%	49%	37%
Not sure	16%	10%	16%	20%





	Base	Age		
		18 to 29	30 to 45	46 to 65
Copper-Nickel Mine Upstream Acceptable/-Unacceptable				
Copper-nickel mining - is unacceptable and should not occur upstream from both Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters	48%	49%	51%	43%
Copper-nickel mining - is acceptable upstream from Lake Superior but unacceptable upstream from the Boundary Waters	17%	23%	14%	17%
Copper -nickel mining- is acceptable and should be permitted upstream from both Lake Superior and the Boundary Waters	26%	20%	28%	28%
Not sure	8%	8%	7%	11%

