

## Johnson, Bill H (DNR)

---

**From:** Carlson, Erik (DNR)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 09, 2012 4:43 PM  
**To:** Koelfgen, Katie E (MPCA); Clark, Richard (MPCA); John Adams ([REDACTED])  
Jim Finley ([REDACTED]) 'Schwanz, Neil T MVP'; David Blaha; Al Trippel  
([REDACTED]) Olson, Michael (DNR); Wenz, Zach (DNR)  
**Cc:** Liljegren, Michael W (DNR); Engstrom, Jennifer N (DNR); Kunz, Michael (DNR); Colvin,  
Steve E (DNR); Johnson, Bill H (DNR)  
**Subject:** Comprehensive Results Review, ERM QA/QC, AMMP  
**Attachments:** Water Modeling Review Diagram of Information Flow 050912.docx

Greetings,

There has been a change in the water modeling review process that effects two process steps. PolyMet, at the request of the DNR, is now including in their proposed project the 13 engineering controls (ECs) they have identified as necessary for their project to comply with permitting standards.

### Effects on Comprehensive Results Check

Barr will re-issue the Excel model results generator tool. This tool will generate results from the project + ECs. Reviewing model results from the project + ECs will allow for a more complete review and is a better use of staff time. For purposes of the comprehensive results check, which is aimed at identifying issues with model functionality, PolyMet will use their EC performance parameter assumptions (e.g. amount of infiltration through Cat 1 geomembrane cover). *Please do not review the current mine site results.* New results should be forthcoming in about 1.5 weeks.

### Effects on QA/QC

Because the project is changing, ERM's next QA/QC (task 1 and 2) would reflect the project + ECs. Barr is prepared to provide ERM materials to be able to do the check on the project + ECs. Dave or Al, if you see an issue with this please let me know.

### Effects Adaptive Mitigation Management Plan

None. For those of you reviewing the AMMP, please continue with your review. AMMP development, which will occur in parallel with tasks above, will capture Agency-PolyMet agreed to EC performance parameters and the model will be updated. The project + agreed to EC performance parameters will be the project reviewed against impact criteria to determine project permitability.

I have modified the water modeling process diagram to reflect these changes. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Erik Carlson, AICP  
Principal Planner  
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources  
[REDACTED]